



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE DATES OF THE EXILES OF PEISISTRATOS.

BY HAROLD N. FOWLER.

SINCE the discovery and publication of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* of Aristotle various attempts have been made to reconcile the Aristotelian account of Peisistratos and his rule with the facts (or supposed facts) known from other sources. In his note on *Ἀθ. πολ.* 14. 3, Sandys gives a conspectus of the views of Bauer, Poland, Kenyon, and Th. Reinach, and discusses them at some length, without, however, reaching any definite conclusion. Since the appearance of Sandys' edition, U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (*Aristoteles und Athen*, vol. I, pp. 21 ff.) and J. B. Bury (*Class. Rev.* 1895, pp. 106 f.) have propounded new theories. If I bring forward still another attempt at a solution of the difficulties, it is because one or two small but important considerations seem to me to have been overlooked. For convenience I copy Sandys' table of the four systems of chronology first mentioned above, adding those of v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Bury.

	BAUER.	POLAND.	KENYON.	REINACH.	V. WIL.-M.	BURY.
First <i>τυραννίς</i> . . .	5	5	5	5	5	C. 5
First exile . . .	6	6	4	3	4	6
Second <i>τυραννίς</i> . .	1	6	6	6	2	1 -
Second exile . . .	10	10	10	10	10 +	10
Third <i>τυραννίς</i> . . .	11	6	8	C. 9	11 +	C. 12
Years of <i>τυραννίς</i> . .	17	17	19	C. 20	18 +	17 to 19
Years of exile . . .	16	16	14	C. 13	14 +	16 -

Two dates may be regarded as fixed. Peisistratos began to rule in 560 and died in 527. These dates have long been known, and v. Wilamowitz (*l.c.*) has reviewed the evidence without finding a flaw

in it. That the first τυραννίς lasted five years is distinctly stated Ἀθ. πολ. 14. 3, οὐπω δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐρριζωμένης ὁμοφρονήσαντες [οἱ] περὶ τὸν Μεγακλέα καὶ τὸν Λυκοῦ[ργο]ν ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔκτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὴν πρώτην κατάστασιν, ἐφ' ἧς Ἡγησίον ἄρχοντος. So far all is in order, or, at any rate, nobody has as yet objected to the term of five years for the first τυραννίς.

The statement in the Ἀθ. πολ. concerning the duration of the first exile has been rejected with great unanimity. We read ἔτει δὲ δωδεκάτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα περιελαυνόμενος ὁ Μεγακλῆς τῇ στάσει, πάλιν ἐπικηρυκευσάμενος πρὸς [τὸ]ν Πεισίστρατον ἐφ' ᾧ τε τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ λήψεται, κατήγαγεν αὐτὸν ἀρχαϊκῶς καὶ λίαν ἀπλῶς. This has been altered in various ways. Bauer, Poland, and Bury assume that ἔτει δωδεκάτῳ is reckoned from the beginning of the first τυραννίς. This necessitates the change of μετὰ ταῦτα to μετὰ ταύτην (Bauer), referring to τὴν πρώτην κατάστασιν, or the rejection of μετὰ ταῦτα altogether. Bury thinks these words were introduced by a scribe "not understanding that ἔτει δωδεκάτῳ referred to the starting point of the πρώτη κατάστασις," and calls them "erroneously explicit." Kenyon and Reinach change δωδεκάτῳ to τετάρτῳ, while v. Wilamowitz, though confessing that there is no palaeographical probability to support him, changes δωδεκάτῳ to πέμπτῳ to make the number fit the dates; as he says, "so zwingt die Rechnung" (*Arist. u. Athen* I, p. 23). I do not believe in the necessity of any emendation. Accepting the reading of the manuscript of the Ἀθ. πολ. (the only authority we have on the subject), I assume that the first τυραννίς of Peisistratos lasted five years, and his first exile eleven.

Concerning the second period of rule, Aristotle says (15. 1): μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, ὡς ἐξέπεσε τὸ δεύτερον ἔτει μάλιστα ἐβδόμῳ μετὰ τὴν κάθοδον, — οὐ γὰρ πολὺν χρόνον κατείχεν, ἀλλ[ὰ] διὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι τῇ τοῦ Μεγακλέους θυγατρὶ συγγίγνεσθαι φοβηθεὶς ἀμφοτέρας τὰς στάσεις ὑπεξῆλθεν.¹ καὶ πρῶτον μὲν, κτέ.

¹ This is properly characterized by Kaibel, *Stil u. Text d. πολ.* Ἀθ. p. 155, as a "Periodenmonstrum." If Kenyon's reading ὡς is correct, there must be some fault in the text lower down. The elimination of ὡς seems to be the easiest mode of emendation, but the rejection of καὶ before πρῶτον makes quite as good a sentence and better sense. That κατείχεν for manuscript κατέσχεν is necessary seems too evident to need argument. Nevertheless v. Wilamowitz, *Arist. u. Athen* I,

Von Wilamowitz and Bury say this is nonsense, on the ground that, as Aristotle has not expressly called the first *τυραννίς* of five years *short*, he cannot say οὐ γὰρ πολλὸν χρόνον κατείχεον of the second *τυραννίς* of six years. And indeed at first sight it does seem as if οὐ γὰρ πολλὸν χρόνον κατείχεον were intended to contrast the second *τυραννίς* with the first. But on second thoughts it is evident that this is not the case. The passage in 14. 3, quoted above, οὐπω δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐρριζωμένης, κτέ., would also (but for the ἔκτω ἔτει) seem at first sight to refer to a very brief rule, for the ἀρχή might be expected to be pretty firmly rooted before the lapse of five years. But the numeral has not been tampered with by anyone, and there is no excuse for tampering with it. Οὐπω τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐρριζωμένης implies that throughout the five years the rule of Peisistratos met with constant opposition, so that it was unable to take firm root. If five years is not a long enough period to allow the rule to take firm root, a period of six years' occupation may fairly be considered short. "He was driven out in the seventh year, — for his power was not (as was seen the first time) such that he could maintain himself long."¹

p. 22, reads κατέσχεον, which he carefully abstains from translating. The imperfect is needed even if the verb refers only to the second period of rule; but there is no reason why it should not refer to the first as well: "He did not (in either case) succeed in maintaining himself long in power."

¹ Comparison of these passages with Herodotos shows that the second *τυραννίς* is not contrasted as regards its length with the first. There is so much verbal similarity between Aristotle and Herodotos here, that, although Aristotle abbreviates, amplifies, and even corrects Herodotos, his account is manifestly based in great part on that of Herodotos. We read then, Hdt. i. 60, Μετὰ δὲ οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον τωτὸ φρονήσαντες οἱ τε τοῦ Μεγακλέους στασιῶται καὶ οἱ τοῦ Λυκούργου ἐξελαύνουσι μιν. οὐτω μὲν Πεισίστρατος ἔσχε τὸ πρῶτον Ἀθήνας, καὶ τὴν τυραννίδα οὐκω κάρτα ἐρριζωμένην ἔχων ἀπέβαλε. If Arist. 14. 3 omits the οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον, it is because he regards οὐπω τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐρριζωμένης as a sufficient indication that the period of rule (five years) was not long. Nor can the failure of Herodotos to give the duration of the second *τυραννίς* be accepted as a proof that it was very short. He may not have known the exact dates (for he had apparently access to less complete information than Aristotle) or he may not have considered them important. It seems to me, too, that the story, Hdt. i. 61, about the neglect of the daughter of Megakles implies that the second period of rule lasted for some years. Certainly Bury's theory that the second *τυραννίς* lasted but a few months is not supported by Hdt. i. 61, τὰ μὲν νυν πρῶτα ἔκρυπτε ταῦτα ἡ γυνή, μετὰ δὲ εἶτε ἱστορεύσθαι εἶτε καὶ οὐ φράζει τῇ ἐωνυγῇ μητρὶ, κτέ., for it would seem but natural that

After the second *τυραννίς* comes the second exile. Here Aristotle gives more information than Herodotos about Peisistratos's movements, yet it is evident here also that, whatever attidographic or documentary evidence Aristotle may have consulted, he did not neglect Herodotos, whose account (i. 61) is as follows: ἀπικόμενος δὲ εἰς Ἐρέτριαν ἐβουλεύετο ἅμα τοῖς παισὶ. Ἰππίω δὲ γνώμην νικήσαντος ἀνακᾶσθαι ὀπίσω τὴν τυραννίδα, ἐνθαῦτα ἤγειρον δωτίνας, κτέ. . . . 62. Ἐξ Ἐρετρίης δὲ ὀρμηθέντες διὰ ἐνδεκάτου ἔτους ἀπίκοντο ὀπίσω, κτέ. Aristotle, 15. 1, 2, says: ἡ μὲν οὖν πρώτη κάθοδος ἐ[γένετο] τοιαύτη. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὡς ἐξέπεσε . . . πρῶτον μὲν συνώκισε . . . ἐκείθεν δὲ παρήλθεν . . . ὅθεν . . . ἐλθὼν εἰς Ἐρέτριαν ἐνδεκάτῳ πάλιν ἔτει τό(ς)τε πρῶτον ἀνασώσασθαι βίᾳ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπεχείρει, κτέ. The verbal similarity is not striking, and some details are differently given; nevertheless it seems to me pretty clear that Aristotle or his "source" had the account of Herodotos in mind. Sandys in his note on πάλιν says this "confirms the account of Hdt., implying that Peisistratos had in the first instance retired to Eretria, though we are not expressly told so in the text." Herodotos does not tell us that Peisistratos went to any other place than Eretria, evidently regarding his other movements as unimportant so far as the narrative is concerned. Aristotle, on the other hand, mentions a number of other places, and ends by saying that Peisistratos went to Eretria before making his attempt to recover his power in Athens. It seems to me that the two accounts are to be reconciled, not by assuming that Peisistratos went first from Athens to Eretria, afterwards returning to the same place, but that Herodotos simply does not care to mention his movements before he reached Eretria. Incidentally, this might serve as a hint that those movements did not take many years and were not of the highest importance. Sandys' explanation of πάλιν seems to me unsatisfactory. Still more unsatisfactory is Kaibel's remark (*Stil u.*

some time must elapse before the wife would care to bring such an accusation against her husband. Then after Megakles himself became incensed, some further time may have elapsed before Peisistratos found it necessary to leave the city. The two years assumed by v. Wilamowitz might be long enough, but as there is no manuscript authority for two years and Aristotle says six, it seems not improbable that six may be right.

Text, p. 13) that *πάλιν* seems to be inserted on account of the hiatus. That is no doubt the reason why *πάλιν* stands just where it does, but it is by no means meaningless. The only question is, what does it mean, and what does it modify? Sandys takes it with *ἐλθών*, for which I see no reason. I believe it belongs with *ἐπεχείρει*, and that it means not "back" but "again."¹ In the *Ἀθ. πολ.* the following cases of *πάλιν* occur: 11. 2, οἱ δὲ γνώριμοι (ῥοντο) [πᾶ]λιν ἢ τὴν αὐτὴν τάξιν ἀποδώσειν ἢ, κτέ., where *πάλιν* may possibly mean "on the other hand," but more probably belongs with *ἀποδώσειν* and means "again"; 14. 4, *πάλιν* ἐπικηρυκευσάμενος, "again," referring to reestablishment of peace between the factions, not to the bringing back *again* (for this was the first time) of Peisistratos; 15. 2, our passage; 16. 9, ὅτ' ἐκπέσοι *πάλιν* ἀνελάμβανε ῥαδίως, where it seems to emphasize the contrast between ἐκπέσοι and ἀνελάμβανε, but may perhaps emphasize the repetition of the act of recovering the rule, "he recovered it again and again"; 20. 2, ὁ δὲ Ἰσαγόρας ἐπιλειπόμενος τῇ δυνάμει *πάλιν* ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸν Κλεομένην, where *πάλιν* means "again," referring to the previous presence of Kleomenes (19. 5); 4. 3, *πάλιν* ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς, also denotes repetition; 12. 2, 3, 4, and 5 *πάλιν* means "again,"

¹ Herodotos uses the expression ἀπικοντο ὀπίσω. Here ὀπίσω does not correspond exactly to the *πάλιν* of Aristotle, for Herodotos uses ὀπίσω with ἀπικοντο, not with any word like ἐπεχείρει. In i. 61, ἀνακτᾶσθαι ὀπίσω τὴν τυραννίδα, and i. 130, ἀποστάντες δὲ ὀπίσω κατεστράφησαν μάχῃ νικηθέντες, and possibly in i. 68, μετρήσας (sc. τὸν νεκρὸν) συνέχωσα ὀπίσω, iii. 75, εἰ μὴ ἀνακτησαίτο ὀπίσω τὴν ἀρχήν, and vii. 57, ὀπίσω δὲ περὶ ἐωυτοῦ τρέχων ἦξεν ἐς τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον, the idea of iteration is implied if not expressed, but in all these cases there is a return to a former place or condition, so that it would be wrong to render ἀπικοντο ὀπίσω in such a way as to imply distinctly that it was a *second* return. But in telling of the rules and exiles of Peisistratos, Herodotos seems by special phrases to mark the points from which he reckons time, e.g., i. 60, μετὰ δὲ οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον, *ibid.* οὕτω μὲν Πεισίστρατος ἔσχε τὸ πρῶτον Ἀθήνας, 61, ἀπολαβὼν δὲ τὴν τυραννίδα τρόπῳ τῷ εἰρημένῳ. Now after the beginning of 61 there is no expression marking a fixed point of time. As Herodotos gives no period, even in the most indefinite way, for the second τυραννίς, he naturally reckons, in using the expression διὰ ἐνδεκάτου ἔτεος, from his last fixed point, i.e., from the first restoration. Otherwise we might imagine that διὰ ἐνδεκάτου ἔτεος was reckoned from the time of Peisistratos's arrival in Eretria. There may have been some special reason for dating in this way which is now no longer to be discovered.

though in a somewhat peculiar and restricted sense, as it merely introduces quotations from Solon's poems.¹

Now if *πάλιν* means "again" and is joined with *ἐπεχείρει*, the connexion of thought is as follows: — "Such was his first restoration. But after this, when he had been driven out, etc., coming to Eretria, he again undertook in the eleventh year (evidently after his previous restoration) to recover his rule, and now for the first time he employed force." The restoration is the only thing repeated, so *πάλιν* refers back to the previous restoration. But if this is the case *ἐνδεκάτῳ ἔτει* cannot refer to anything else. The sentence is made obscure by its length, by the fault in the text in the early part, and to some degree also by the position of *βία* after *ἀνασώσασθαι*, which last is, however, accounted for by the hiatus that would be caused if *βία* stood where we should otherwise expect it, before *ἀνασώσασθαι*.

The second return of Peisistratos took place, then, in the eleventh year after the first. That leaves but four years for the second exile. This is, however, quite enough. To be sure Hdt., i. 61, says *χρόνος διέφνυ*, but this does not necessarily mean a long time, nor need we assume that more than four years would be required for the business and the political combinations mentioned by Aristotle. Peisistratos had made up his mind to return, he had his sons to help him, and he was not the man to let the grass grow under his feet.

Our chronology is then as follows: first *τυραννίς* B.C. 560–555, first exile 555–544; second *τυραννίς* 544–538, second exile 538–534; third

¹ 12. 5 Sandys' text reads *καὶ πάλιν ὀνειδίζων πρὸς τὰς ὕστερον αὐτ[ῶν] μεμψιμοιρίας ἀμφοτέρων*, and his critical apparatus gives no other reading except *αἰθῆς* for *αὐτῶν*. I would suggest *αὐτοῦ* (or *αὐτοῦ*), an objective genitive.

This may be as good a place as any to suggest what I believe to be a new interpretation of the second line of the poem of Solon 12. 4,

ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν μὲν οὐνεκα ξυνήγαγον
 δῆμον, τί τούτων πρὶν τυχεῖν ἐπαυσάμην;

I punctuate (after Jebb, Sandys, and others) with a question mark, and interpret not "why did I stop?" but "in regard to which of these things did I stop before attaining it?" This seems to me to be demanded by lines 15–17,

ταῦτα μὲν κράτει
 νόμον, βίαν τε καὶ δίκην συναρμόσας,
 [ἔρ]εξα, καὶ διήλθον ὡς ὑπασχόμεν.

If this interpretation is not new, it has hitherto escaped my notice.

τυραννίς 534-527. This gives as the total for the years of τυραννίς $5 + 6 + 7 = 18$. But the fact that Aristotle gives all his dates in ordinal numbers makes it impossible for us to perform the addition with accuracy. The same fact, as has been observed by others, enables us to reconcile Ἀθ. πολ. 17. 1 ἀφ' οὗ μὲν κατέστη τὸ πρῶτον τυράννος, ἔτη τριά[κο]ν[τ]α καὶ τρία βιώσας, ἃ δ' ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ διέμεινεν, ἐνὸς δέοντα εἴκοσι with Pol. viii. (v.) 12, 1315 b, ἐν ἔτεσι τριάκοντα καὶ τρισὶν ἑπτακαίδεκα ἔτη τούτων ἐτυράννευσεν, by supposing that in one reckoning the fractions of years are counted in the periods of rule, in the other in the periods of exile.¹

So far as mere arithmetic is concerned there is no difficulty in accepting this chronology. It may be objected that the statement Ἀθ. πολ. 16. 9, δίο καὶ πολλὸν χρόνον ἔμεινεν (ἐν) [τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ] ὅτ' ἐκπέσοι πάλιν ἀνελάμβανε ῥαδίως and that 17. 1, Πεισίστρατος μὲν οὖν ἐγκατεγήρασε τῇ ἀρχῇ imply that the last period of rule was much longer than either of the other two. But there is nothing to show

¹ One point in this chronology deserves an additional word. The battle of Pallene is assigned to the year 534. Von Wilamowitz, *Arist. u. Athen* I, p. 24, says: "In der chronik des Eusebius steht (oder hat gestanden) der anfang des Peisistratos richtig zu ol. 54,4, der tod des Hipparchos zu 65,3; dazwischen steht *Pisistratus apud Athenienses tyrannidem exercuit* zu 59,3 oder 4, also 542 oder 41: das kann nur die schlacht von Pallene meinen ... ich betrachte 541 als ein festes datum für die schlacht von Pallene; dass sie auch 542 gewesen sein kann, ist für jene zeit eine unwesentliche differenz." Now there is a good deal of confusion in the Chronicle of Eusebius as it has come down to us, and such references as that of v. Wilamowitz do not help to clear matters up. The wording of his quotation is that given by Schoene for the *versio Armenia*, where the entire legend is: *Pisistratus apud Athenienses tyrannidem exercuit et in Italiam migravit* (cf. Syncellus, p. 454. 15: Πεισίστρατος Ἀθηναίων ἐτυράννευσε καὶ εἰς Ἰταλίαν παρήλθεν). Now it seems hardly fair to use the first half of this singular statement and neglect the second, though it is hard to see what the second means. Possibly for Ἰταλίαν we should read Ἐρέτριαν, but even then there remains plenty of difficulty. Perhaps some reference is intended to the sojourn of Peisistratos in Eretria or the assistance granted him by the Eretrians. At any rate, until some good explanation of the second part of the statement in Eusebius is offered, it seems rather daring to use the first part to fix the date of the battle of Pallene. Still, if the first part of the statement may be used apart from the second, it fits admirably the chronology I have proposed, for the year 541 is the middle year of the middle τυραννίς of Peisistratos, and not very far from the middle year of his whole period of interrupted power, 560-527.

that 16. 9 refers to any one period of rule, in fact I should think it much more reasonable to refer it to the three periods collectively, and certainly if Peisistratos was already elderly when he obtained the power for the last time, a period of seven or eight years would justify the expression *ἐγκατεγήρασε*. The ordinary duration of a Greek *τυραννίς* must, by the way, have been pretty short and uncertain if Aristotle finds it necessary to call attention to the long continuance in power of a man who ruled nineteen years in all, and those scattered through a period of thirty-three years.

I have tried to interpret the text of the 'Αθ. πολ. without violent emendation. I hope I have succeeded in showing that the dates given in the manuscript do not disagree with the chronological data of Herodotos, and that the account of the tyranny of Peisistratos given in the 'Αθ. πολ. contains nothing impossible, inconsistent, or unreasonable.

APPENDIX.

Iophon, the Son of Peisistratos.

Aristotle, 'Αθ. πολ. 17. 3 f., says ἦσαν δὲ δύο μὲν ἐκ τῆς γαμετῆς, 'Ιππίας καὶ 'Ιππαρχος, δύο δὲ ἐκ τῆς 'Αργείας, 'Ιοφῶν καὶ 'Ηγησίστρατος, ᾧ παρωνύμιον ἦν Θετταλός. ἔγημεν γὰρ Πεισίστρατος ἐξ 'Αργους ἀνδρὸς 'Αργείου θυγατέρα, ᾧ ὄνομα ἦν Γοργίλος Τιμώνασσαν . . . ὅθεν καὶ ἡ πρὸς τοὺς 'Αργείους ἐνέστη φιλία καὶ συνεμαχέσαντο χίλιοι τὴν ἐπὶ Παλληνίδι μάχην 'Ηγησιστράτου κομίσαντος. γῆμαι δὲ φασὶ τὴν 'Αργείαν οἱ μὲν ἐκπεσόντα τὸ πρῶτον, οἱ δὲ κατέχοντα τὴν ἀρχήν. In 18. 2 it is said that Thessalos was νεώτερος πολὺ than Hipparchos. As in 17. 3 Hippias, the eldest, is mentioned before Hipparchos, the second son, it is probable that Iophon, who is mentioned third, was older than Hegesistratos-Thessalos. But the last was old enough to bring a thousand horse to the aid of his father at the battle of Pallene. If that battle took place in 534 and Peisistratos married Timonassa during his first exile, Hegesistratos cannot have been more than twenty years old, even if he and Iophon were twins. If, as is more probable, he was a year or more younger than Iophon, it becomes evident that Peisistratos married Timonassa during his first period of power. This is, by the way, an argument against setting the date

of the battle of Pallene as far back as 542, for if that date were correct, the marriage with Timonassa must have taken place before Peisistratos first obtained the power in 560.

Of Hegesistratos-Thessalos we know only that he was, according to Aristotle, the cause of the murder of Hipparchos, and that he was later (Hdt. v. 94) tyrant of Sigeion. Of Iophon nothing is known except what Aristotle tells us, from which it appears that he was the third son of his father. Von Wilamowitz (*Arist. u. Athen* I, p. 113) thinks Iophon was the tyrant of Sigeion, and that he may have taken his brother's more sounding name when the latter began to call himself Thessalos, or perhaps that Herodotos is wrong. But the only reason for assuming a mistake in Herodotos or an exchange of names among the brothers (the like of which, Toepffer rightly says, is unheard of in Greece), is that Thuc. vi. 55 does not mention Iophon's name as appearing on the *στήλη περὶ τῆς τῶν τυράννων ἀδικίας*. Thucydides probably gives all the names mentioned on the stele, but the fact that the name of Iophon was not recorded does not prove him to be identical with the tyrant of Sigeion. So far as is known, only those were mentioned who had actually been tyrants (or were believed to have been tyrants, as Hipparchos) or were living when the decree was passed and the stele set up. As v. Wilamowitz shows, the stele cannot well have been set up before 479, and it is by no means improbable that Iophon was then dead. The fact that Hegesistratos, and not his elder brother (like himself half Argive), led the Argive horse to the battle of Pallene may be an indication that Iophon died even before that event. This seems more probable than that he lived through the period of his father's prominence, but allowed his younger brother to lead the Argive horse to Pallene, and afterwards to be tyrant of Sigeion, while he himself was of no importance. If, as Toepffer (*Hermes* XXIX, pp. 463 ff.) thinks, Hegesistratos-Thessalos was made an Athenian citizen, while Iophon was not (which would be an unaccountable piece of favoritism on the part of their father), that might account for the omission of Iophon's name from the stele, but it would still not account for his absolute obscurity. The acknowledged son of Peisistratos could be made so utterly insignificant only by being hidden in the darkness of the grave.